UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/019,988	07/24/2002	Brian Evan McGinnis	3COM 2487-3US	5980

22470 7590 01/25/2006

HAYNES BEFFEL & WOLFELD LLP
P O BOX 366
HALF MOON BAY, CA 94019

EXAMINER	
SCUDERI, PHILIP S	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2153	

DATE MAILED: 01/25/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/019,988	MCGINNIS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Philip S. Scuderi	2153	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *10 November 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-63* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-63* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *2,12,13,36 and 63* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This Office action is in response to the communication filed on 10 November 2005.

Claim Objections

The examiner has withdrawn the majority of the claim objections set forth in the last Office action because applicant's amendments have overcome most of the objections. However, the objections to claims 12 and 36 still apply and new objections have been introduced below.

Claim 2 is objected to because it includes a reference character not enclosed within parentheses. Reference characters corresponding to elements recited in the detailed description of the drawings and used in conjunction with the recitation of the same element or group of elements in the claims should be enclosed within parentheses so as to avoid confusion with other numbers or characters which may appear in the claims. See MPEP § 608.01(m).

Claims 12 and 36 are objected to because of a minor informality. The word "a" presumably belongs before the word "communications" in line 2. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 13 is objected to because of a minor informality. The word "sewer" in line 2 should presumably be "server". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 63 is objected to because of a minor informality. The claim is lacking a period. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The examiner has withdrawn the claim rejections under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph because applicant's amendments have overcome the rejections.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 6-11, 14, 16, 18-23, 25-28, 30-35, 38, 40, 42-47, 49-60, and 62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prithviraj (US 5,987,513) in view of Lonnroth (US 6,826,597).

Regarding claim 1, Prithviraj teaches:

accessing a page containing network management information stored on a computer (figure 5 #540, the page must be at least temporarily cached on the client computer by the browser);

indicating a network management function (figure 5 #550);

connecting to a synchronization server (column 18 lines 9-12, figure 5 #560, NMS 101 can be considered a synchronization server because it synchronizes the network topology display according to network conditions);

transmitting the indicated network management function to the synchronization server (figure 5 #550, column 18 lines 9-12); and

receiving updated network management information, responsive to the indicated network management function (figure 5 #560).

Prithviraj does not expressly disclose that the computer is a palm-sized computer. Nonetheless, Prithviraj discloses that the network management interface can be accessed from any machine implementing a browser (column 6 lines 38-43) and it was well-known in the art to access HTTP servers using palm-sized computers, as evidenced by Lonnroth.

In a similar art, Lonnroth teaches accessing an HTTP server (110) a palm-sized computer (210). Given the teachings of Lonnroth, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to access Prithviraj's system using a palm-sized computer in the manner taught by Lonnroth, since portability and small size are both generally desirable traits, as was well known in the art (e.g., US 5,727,159, column 1, lines 36-40).

Regarding claim 25, Prithviraj teaches:

accessing a page containing network inventory scope choices stored on a computer (column 23 lines 54-58, the page must be at least temporarily cached on the client computer by the browser);

indicating a scope of network inventory information (column 23 lines 54-58, selecting a node);

connecting to a synchronization server (column 18 lines 9-12, figure 5 #560, NMS 101 can be considered a synchronization server because it synchronizes the network topology display according to network conditions);

transmitting the indicated scope of network inventory information to the synchronization server (column 23 lines 54-58); and

receiving network management information, responsive to the indicated network management function (column 24 lines 20-28).

Prithviraj does not expressly disclose that the computer is a palm-sized computer. Nonetheless, Prithviraj discloses that the network management interface can be accessed from any machine implementing a browser (column 6 lines 38-43) and it was well-known in the art to access HTTP servers using palm-sized computers, as evidenced by Lonnroth.

In a similar art, Lonnroth teaches accessing an HTTP server (110) a palm-sized computer (210). Given the teachings of Lonnroth, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to access Prithviraj's system using a palm-sized computer in the manner taught by Lonnroth, since portability and small size are both generally desirable traits, as was well known in the art (e.g., US 5,727,159, column 1, lines 36-40).

Regarding claim 49, Prithviraj teaches:

a computer running a browser application (130, 160, 170, etc.);

a synchronization server (column 18 lines 9-12, figure 5 #560, NMS 101 can be considered a synchronization server because it synchronizes the network topology display according to network conditio), in communication with the computer (see figure 1); and

a network management server, in communication with the synchronization server (column 7 lines 35-38, when bundled with NMS 101 server 120 can also be considered a NMS).

Prithviraj does not expressly disclose that the computer is a palm-sized computer. Nonetheless, Prithviraj discloses that the network management interface can be accessed from any machine implementing a browser (column 6 lines 38-43) and it was well-known in the art to access HTTP servers using palm-sized computers, as evidenced by Lonnroth.

In a similar art, Lonnroth teaches accessing an HTTP server (110) a palm-sized computer (210). Given the teachings of Lonnroth, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to access Prithviraj's system using a palm-sized computer in the manner taught by Lonnroth, since portability and small size are both generally desirable traits, as was well known in the art (e.g., US 5,727,159, column 1, lines 36-40).

Regarding claims 2, 26, and 50, the palm-sized computer appears to be smaller than four inches by six inches (Lonnroth, figure 2).

Regarding claims 3, 4, 27, 28, 51, and 52, Lonnroth does not expressly disclose the screen size of the palm-sized computer. However, it would have been obvious to provide a 160 by 160 pixel display because it was well known in the art that 160 by 160 pixel displays were an industry standard (e.g., US 6,288,704, column 2 lines 26-28).

Regarding claims 6, 30, and 53-55, Prithviraj teaches a form for changing a configuration of a device (column 21 line 61 – column 22 line 3). The computer must at least temporarily store the form for display purposes.

Regarding claims 7, 31, and 56-58, Prithviraj teaches a form for changing an inventory description of a device (column 21 line 61 – column 22 line 3). The computer must at least temporarily store the form for display purposes.

Regarding claims 8, 32, 59, and 60, Prithviraj teaches a form for accessing historical information about a device (column 24 line 66 – column 25 line 8). The computer must at least temporarily store the form for display purposes.

Regarding claims 9 and 33, Prithviraj teaches accessing web-based support information (column 18 lines 6-12).

Regarding claims 10 and 34, Prithviraj teaches accessing intranet-based support information (see figure 1).

Regarding claims 11 and 35, Prithviraj teaches accessing server-based support information (column 19 lines 24-26).

Regarding claims 14, 38, and 62, any wireless router in the path between the computer and the server could be considered a wireless communication server because it would server data wirelessly. The examiner takes official notice of such routers to thereby eliminate the need for wires.

Regarding claims 16 and 40, encrypting communications over a network was well known in the art (e.g., US 6,237,093, column 1 lines 50-53). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to encrypt the communications to thereby provide data security.

Regarding claims 18-20 and 42-44, Lonnroth teaches that the transmitting and receiving include encoding and decoding a compact markup language that uses five-bit encoding of characters and variable length strings (see figure 2).

Regarding claims 21, 22, 45, and 46, Prithviraj teaches that the page includes a form and data and the updated network management information includes an updated version of some or all of the data and does not include the form (see figure 5 #560).

Regarding claims 23 and 47, Lonnroth teaches a proxy server that the information is communicated through (see figure 2).

Claims 5 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prithviraj in view of Lonnroth, and further in view of Flack (US 6,288,704).

Regarding claims 5 and 29, Lonnroth does not expressly disclose that the computer uses a pressure-sensitive display and a stylus. However, pressure sensitive displays with styluses used to navigate web pages were well known in the art, as evidenced by Flack (figures 1 and 14, column 9 lines 36-49). Given the teachings of Flack, it would have been obvious to provide a pressure

sensitive display, thereby providing users with a simple and convenient method for controlling the display (Flack, column 3 lines 30-34).

Claims 1, 12, 24, 25, 36, 48, 49, and 61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prithviraj in view of Hawkins (US 6,006,274).

Regarding claims 1, 12, 25, and 36, Prithviraj teaches:

accessing a page containing network management information stored on a computer (figure 5 #540, the page must be at least temporarily cached on the client computer by the browser);

indicating a network management function (figure 5 #550);

connecting to a server (column 18 lines 9-12, figure 5 #560, NMS 101);

transmitting the indicated network management function to the synchronization server (figure 5 #550, column 18 lines 9-12); and

receiving updated network management information, responsive to the indicated network management function (figure 5 #560).

Prithviraj does not expressly disclose that the computer is a palm-sized computer or wherein connecting to the server includes placing the palm-sized computer in a communications cradle and pressing a hot sync button. Nonetheless, Prithviraj discloses that the network management interface can be accessed from any machine implementing a browser (column 6 lines 38-43) and it was well-known in the art to access a server using a palm-sized computer by placing the palm-sized computer in a communications cradle and pressing a hot sync button to synchronize with a server, as evidenced by Hawkins.

In a similar art, Hawkins teaches synchronizing with a server using a palm-sized computer by placing the palm-sized computer in a communications cradle and pressing a hot sync button (column 5 line 23 – column 6 line 12). Given the teachings of Hawkins, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to access the server using a palm-sized computer by placing the palm-sized computer in a communications cradle and pressing a hot sync button. The motivation for using a palm-sized computer would have been because portability and small size are both generally desirable traits, as was well known in the art (e.g., US 5,727,159, column 1, lines 36-40).

Regarding claims 49 and 61, Prithviraj teaches:

a computer running a browser application (130, 160, 170, etc.);

a synchronization server (column 18 lines 9-12, figure 5 #560, NMS 101 can be considered a synchronization server because it synchronizes the network topology display according to network conditio), in communication with the computer (see figure 1); and

a network management server, in communication with the synchronization server (column 7 lines 35-38, when bundled with NMS 101 server 120 can also be considered a NMS).

Prithviraj does not expressly disclose that the computer is a palm-sized computer or wherein connecting to the server includes placing the palm-sized computer in a communications cradle and pressing a hot sync button. Nonetheless, Prithviraj discloses that the network management interface can be accessed from any machine implementing a browser (column 6 lines 38-43) and it was well-known in the art to access a server using a palm-sized computer by placing the palm-sized computer in a communications cradle and pressing a hot sync button to synchronize with a server, as evidenced by Hawkins.

In a similar art, Hawkins teaches synchronizing with a server using a palm-sized computer by placing the palm-sized computer in a communications cradle and pressing a hot sync button (column 5 line 23 – column 6 line 12). Given the teachings of Hawkins, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to access the server using a palm-sized computer by placing the palm-sized computer in a communications cradle and pressing a hot sync button. The motivation for using a palm-sized computer would have been because portability and small size are both generally desirable traits, as was well known in the art (e.g., US 5,727,159, column 1, lines 36-40).

Regarding claims 24 and 48, Prithviraj's server is a network management server (101, see figure 1) and Hawkins' server is a synchronization server (column 5 line 23 – column 6 line 12).

Claims 13, 15, 37, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prithviraj in view of Hawkins, and further in view of Haitani (US 5,900,875).

Regarding claims 13, 15, 37, and 39, waking a synchronization server in order to perform synchronization was well known, as evidenced by Haitani (column 5 lines 30-47). Given the teachings of Haitani, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to wake the synchronization server, thereby enabling the user to connect to the synchronization server.

Claims 17, 41, and 63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prithviraj in view of Hawkins, and further in view of Hiscock (US 6,721,787).

Regarding claims 17, 41, and 63, connecting to a synchronization server using an infrared signal was well known in the art, as evidenced by Hiscock (column 3 lines 21-32). It would have been obvious to connect to the synchronization server using infrared transmission, thereby eliminating the need for the serial cable.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Philip S. Scuderi whose telephone number is (571) 272-5865. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:00 am - 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton B. Burgess can be reached on (571) 272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PSS

KRISNA LIM
PRIMARY EXAMINER